

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/739,305	12/19/2000	Yves Le Gendre	Q62357	3328		
7	590 04/28/2004		EXAM	INER		
•	SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC			GARY, ERIKA A		
Suite 800 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	OC 20037-3213		2681			
			DATE MAILED: 04/28/2004	\$		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		LE GENDRE ET AL.		
· Advisory Action	09/739,305 Examiner	Art Unit		
o/	Erika A. Gary	2681		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe				
THE REPLY FILED 08 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	HIS APPLICATION IN CONDITI avoid abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment wh al (with appeal fee); or (3) a tim	ON FOR ALLOWANCE. cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in		
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. Insign and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee efee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:			
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);		
(b) $\hfill\Box$ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	I be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment		
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: Set	or reconsideration has been consecutions	sidered but does NOT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly		
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b)□ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u> .				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	•		
10. Other:				
				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Grube does not teach sending from the target mobile radio a request for information regarding the identity of the source mobile radio. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and finds this limitation in Grube's disclosure in column 2, lines 5-15 which states that "the target communication unit transmits, during transmission of the voice message, a caller data request regarding the source communication unit". Applicant also argues that Grube is directed to a mobile radio system while DeFazio is directed to a telephone network. The Examiner contends that it is well known in the art to implement features of a wireless network into a telephone network and vice versa. It has been held that rearranging of parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70. The Examiner maintains that the combination of references is proper and renders Applicant's invention obvious.

ERIKA GARY

PATENT EXAMINER